

MINUTES

CITY PLAN COMMISSION/ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

JULY 18, 2016

The City Plan Commission/Architectural Review Board of the City of Clayton, Missouri, met upon the above date at 5:30 p.m. Upon roll call, the following responded:

Present:

Chairman Steve Lichtenfeld
Joanne M. Boulton, Aldermanic Representative
Craig Owens, City Manager
Ron Reim
William Liebermann

Absent:

Josh Corson
Pepe Finn

Also in Attendance:

Susan M. Istenes, AICP, Director of Planning & Development Services
Louis Clayton, AICP, Planner

Chairman Steve Lichtenfeld asked that all cell phone ringers be turned off, that conversations take place outside the meeting room and that those who wish to speak approach the podium and to be sure the green light on the microphone is on for proper recording of this meeting.

MINUTES

The minutes of the July 5, 2016 meeting were presented for approval. The minutes were approved after having been previously distributed to each member.

CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT – THE EXERCISE COACH – 8500 MARYLAND AVENUE (VANGUARD CLAYTON APARTMENT BUILDING)

Don Eisenberg was in attendance at the meeting.

Susan Istenes explained that this is a request for a Conditional Use Permit for the operation of a fitness studio known as The Exercise Coach. The 2.4-acre site is located along the western city limits at the southwest corner of Maryland Avenue and Gay Avenue and has a zoning designation of Planned Unit Development (PUD). On May 12, 2015, the Board of Aldermen approved plans for a 273,500 square foot, five-story building located on top of a two-level, partially below grade

parking structure. The building is currently under construction and will contain 4,526 square feet of ground floor retail and live/work units, 229 residential units and 352 parking spaces. The 1,457-square-foot tenant space is located at the northeast corner of the building fronting Maryland Avenue. The business will offer indoor, one-on-one and small group personal training. The maximum number of clients at one time typically does not exceed five people. In addition to personal training services, the business will sell fitness related products such as health and nutrition guides, vitamin supplements, energy bars and clothing. The proposed hours of operation are 6:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. Monday through Friday, and 7:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. on Saturday. Conditional uses are those types of uses that are considered to be desirable, necessary or convenient to the community but which by their nature can create additional traffic volume, parking demand beyond the development's capacity, and/or a detrimental impact on adjacent or neighboring properties due to noise, pollutants or other characteristics associated with that particular use. Health clubs/fitness centers are permitted in this zoning district subject to approval of a conditional use permit. Training activities will take place indoors during normal business hours, consistent with other nearby businesses. Outdoor activities are not proposed at this time. Traffic impacts for the entire site were reviewed and approved through the Planned Unit Development process. The proposed health club will provide personal training and fitness training to individuals and small groups. Large group classes are not proposed. Due to the nature of the proposed business, staff does not anticipate a substantial increase in vehicular traffic volumes. Automobile and bicycle parking for the entire site was reviewed and approved through the Planned Unit Development process. Additional parking is not required for this use. The proposed health club will provide personal training and fitness training to individuals and small groups. Large group classes are not proposed. Due to the nature of the proposed business, staff does not believe that the noise associated with this use will be disruptive to the surrounding area. Director Istenes stated that staff is of the opinion that the proposed use meets the criteria for conditional use permit approval and recommends approval of the Conditional Use Permit to the Board of Aldermen with the condition that onsite fitness classes and training shall be limited to indoor areas only.

Mr. Eisenberg informed the members that he operates two other locations and that there are a total of forty nation-wide. He stated he is excited to bring his business to Clayton.

Chairman Lichtenfeld noted that the floor plan provided only shows his tenant space. He asked the applicant if his business will occupy about one-third of the first floor of the building.

Paul Langdon, Covington Realty Partners, property owner, replied "yes".

Chairman Lichtenfeld asked if there is a second way out of the space.

Mr. Eisenberg indicated that there is a rear exit door.

Ron Reim asked for confirmation that there will be no outside activity.

Mr. Eisenberg confirmed that there will never be outside activity.

Hearing no further questions or comments and hearing none from the audience, Chairman Lichtenfeld called for a motion.

Ron Reim made a motion to recommend approval of the conditional use permit to the Board of Aldermen with the condition that on-site fitness classes and training shall be limited to indoor areas only. The motion was seconded by Joanne Boulton and unanimously approved by the members.

Chairman Lichtenfeld asked about timing.

Mr. Eisenberg stated that it depends on how quickly the building is up and ready.

Chairman Lichtenfeld welcomed Mr. Eisenberg to Clayton.

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW – ADDITION TO SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE – 6319
ALEXANDER DRIVE

Lauren Strutman, project architect, was in attendance at the meeting. Also in attendance were the owners, Scott & Elisabeth Meyland-Smith.

Susan Istenes explained that the existing two-story home measures 3,578 square feet, and the proposed project consists of the construction of a two-story, 425-square-foot rear addition and a 640-square-foot attached garage at the rear of the home. Because the combined square footage of the additions is less than 50 percent of the total square footage of the home, Site Plan Review is not required. Because the combined square footage of the additions is greater than 750 square feet, Architectural Review is required. Subdivision trustee approval has been submitted. The additions are located at the rear of the home and are not visible from the street. The primary building materials for the proposed additions are red brick with light brown fiber cement board siding. The proposed roof of the addition will be clad in gray architectural asphalt shingles, and tan casement windows are proposed. A tan colored carriage style garage is proposed. All building materials will match the existing home. The plans show the HVAC units located on the right side of the home and screened by a wood fence. Based on the number of bedrooms, a 40-square-foot trash enclosure is required; however, it is not shown on the plans. An existing concrete driveway provides access from the street to an existing rear entry garage. The applicant proposes to remove and replace the rear portion of the existing driveway with concrete. With respect to driveways, the City's Architectural Guidelines read as follows:

To eliminate the appearance of "a sea of concrete", the driveway should be exposed aggregate, brick pavers or stamped concrete.

Director Istenes noted that staff is of the opinion that the intent of this guideline is to apply to driveways that are visible from public streets. Because the front portion of the driveway will remain in place and the driveway in the rear will be replaced with the same material to maintain visual conformity, so therefore, staff supports the use of concrete for the driveway replacement.

Director Istenes stated that staff is of the opinion that the proposed design of the additions is consistent with existing design and materials on the home and on other homes in the neighborhood and therefore, recommends approval with the condition that the applicant submit revised plans showing the required 40-square-foot trash enclosure, to be approved by staff prior to the issuance of a building permit.

Ms. Strutman introduced the owners to the members and then she presented elevation drawings and material samples (brick, fiber cement siding, windows and roofing material). She stated that the addition, which will connect the kitchen to the living area, is to the rear of the home and that the Trustees have signed-off on the project. Adding a terrace at the main level with a garage below is also part of the project.

A site plan was presented. Ms. Strutman informed the members that they will add a trash enclosure per staff recommendation.

Chairman Lichtenfeld noted that there is no requirement for site plan review for this project; he asked if coverage is decreasing.

Ms. Strutman stated that the new garage is going over the existing paved driveway, so there is only a small increase in coverage (going from 35.2% to 37.8%; 55% would be allowed per Code).

Chairman Lichtenfeld asked what the existing “bump-out” at the driveway is.

Ms. Strutman stated that they are not sure.

Chairman Lichtenfeld commented that the additions look great; they look like they are part of the original home.

Ron Reim commented that the project is sensitive and was well-thought out.

Hearing no further questions or comments and hearing none from the audience, Chairman Lichtenfeld called for a motion.

Ron Reim made a motion to approve per staff recommendation (to provide the required 40-square-foot trash enclosure; show on plans for staff review and approval prior to permit issuance). The motion was seconded by Joanne Boulton and unanimously approved by the members.

Chairman Lichtenfeld asked when they hope to pull their permits.

Ms. Strutman indicated that they’d like to begin work in August.

PUBLIC HEARING - TEXT AMENDMENT – CONSIDERATION OF TEXTAMENDMENTS TO THE CITY’S ZONING REGULATIONS RELATED TO TOWNHOUSES

Susan Istenes explained that inconsistencies in the City's Land Use Code regarding townhouses were discovered during consideration of the previously proposed Maryland School Townhouse Development; however, the inconsistency issue was overcome with for that project and modifications not pursued because that project was being proposed as a planned unit development (PUD). She noted that previous iterations of the Zoning Ordinance specifically listed "townhouse" in the zoning use tables of the R-4 to R-7 Zoning Districts (Multiple Dwelling Districts) as an allowable use, provided a Conditional Use Permit was obtained. As a result of subsequent modifications to the Zoning Ordinance, "townhouse" was dropped from the use tables, but references to townhouses continued to remain in other parts of the regulations (including the "Definitions" section and the "Governing Regulations" section). Consequently, "townhouse" is defined in the Zoning Regulations, but is not expressly allowed in any zoning district. Based on the current townhouse definition, a townhouse may occupy a single platted lot (condominium form of ownership) or multiple platted lots (fee simple form of ownership). These two ownership types are treated differently by the Zoning Regulations even though when built they are often indistinguishable. Director Istenes noted that research shows that townhouses exist in Clayton. Historically, condominium type townhouses have been considered a type of multi-family land use, which is a permitted use in multi-family residential zoning districts (R-4 to R-7) and subject to the minimum lot width and area requirements for multi-family residential units. Townhouses built on individually owned lots (fee simple) historically have required a conditional use permit and each individual lot is subject to the minimum lot width and area requirements for the zoning district. During the time of the Maryland School Townhouse proposal was being reviewed, staff determined that because "town house" is defined but not specifically allowed in any zoning district, the Board of Aldermen would be required to take legislative action to permit a town house as a use either through the Planned Unit Development rezoning process or through a text amendment to the Zoning Regulations. The developer for the Maryland School Townhomes opted to request a rezoning to Planned Unit Development (PUD) which would have allowed town houses on individual lots, as a permitted use. Director Istenes noted that staff is proposing revisions to the current Zoning Ordinance definition of town house to clarify that a town house is a type of multiple-dwelling, not an attached single-family dwelling. This change would make town houses with a condominium form of ownership (one commonly owned lot) an allowable use in all multiple-dwelling zoning districts (R-4 to R-7), which is consistent with the City's historic requirements for this type of use. These changes will not affect the intended code requirements for a conditional use permit for town houses built on individual lots (fee simple). Minor changes are also proposed to Section 405.280 for consistency with the definitional change. Director Istenes stated that in general, town houses are a desirable housing type and are appropriate in multiple family zoning districts and, if adopted, the amendments will clarify that a town house is a type of multiple-family dwelling and therefore, when all units are built on a single lot, the use is considered a permitted use in all multiple-family zoning districts, which is consistent with the City's historic requirements for this type of use. The changes do not affect the conditional use permit requirement for townhomes built on individually owned (fee simple) building lots. Staff does not anticipate negative impacts associated with the proposed text amendments. She then noted that these proposed text amendments only address a few of the issues in the Zoning Regulations related to town houses that were identified by staff and that further research and

evaluation will be required in order to prepare additional text amendments addressing the following:

1. Define Multi-Family Attached Dwelling
2. Address inconsistent definitions and requirements in the Overlay & Urban Design Districts
3. Clarify whether fee simple town house and attached two-family dwellings should be permitted or conditional uses.
4. Clarify minimum lot width and area requirements for fee simple town house and two-family dwellings.

Director Istenes continued by stating that the proposed changes will make the zoning district regulations consistent with the definition of town house and harmonious with the provisions of Section 405.280, which address the requirements for a Conditional Use Permit in order to develop town house dwellings on individual building lots, until such a time that staff can further research and evaluate the additional text amendments noted above. Staff recommends approval of the text amendments to Chapter 405 (Zoning Regulations) of the City's Land Use Code to the Board of Aldermen as proposed.

Chairman Lichtenfeld asked for confirmation that this text amendment request has no effect on another agenda item.

Susan Istenes concurred. She stated that the proposed project at 121 North Brentwood is dependent on the successful changes to the Code, as currently, the project is not an allowable use. She added that the City staff opted to pursue the text amendments versus the developer. She commented that this item is independent of Agenda Item B and would affect all properties within the City.

Chairman Lichtenfeld asked if townhouses would only be allowed in properties that have a zoning designation of R-4 through R-7.

Susan Istenes replied "yes".

Chairman Lichtenfeld asked for confirmation that townhouses would not be permitted in R-1 or R-2 zoning districts.

Susan Istenes concurred.

Chairman Lichtenfeld asked if it is the intent here is to be consistent and correct errors in the language.

Susan Istenes concurred.

On motion by Joanne Boulton and seconded by Ron Reim, the public hearing was opened.

Joanne Boulton asked if this is different than a 2-family.

Susan Istenes replied “yes”, noting that townhomes are defined in the code but are not listed as an allowed use.

William Liebermann asked how the two fee-simple townhomes were approved in 1997 if they were not allowed by Code.

Susan Istenes indicated that she did not know the answer to that question, other than to say that it was an interpretation of the Code by the staff at that time. She noted that conditional use permits were issued for those buildings.

Joanne Boulton referred to the impact of these amendments and the comment in the staff report that there are issues that need further evaluation; emphasizing the Overlay and Urban Design Districts.

Louis Clayton indicated that when staff initially looked at proposed text amendments, they considered a broader range and ended up scaling back to allow more research time before changes are proposed.

Chairman Lichtenfeld asked if that means that what is being considered tonight is limited and other proposed changes will be dealt with at a later time.

Louis Clayton concurred.

Chairman Lichtenfeld asked if everyone was okay with that.

Joanne Bolton commented that because she does not know what the inconsistencies are, she can’t say.

Louis Clayton stated that there are only two sections that contain proposed amendments this evening: 405.280 “General Regulations” by replacing “attached single-family dwelling structure utilizing common walls” with “townhouse dwelling” and amending the definition section (405.390) of “townhouse” and deleting the definition of “single-family attached”.

Keith Kramer, 8016 Pershing, asked the members to table this item as there is a lack of clear understanding of the implications and that more careful thought and work may be needed. He stated that he wonders how other cities regulate townhomes with regard to height, density, etc.

Fred Berger, attorney representing the Porta’s who own the property at 8110 Westmoreland, stated that he appreciates the hard work by the City every day. He stated that he believes the text amendments (incorrectly making referenced to Section 405.2160 as the permitted use table) have

everything to do with the proposal at 121 North Brentwood Boulevard and that there should be no townhouses in the gorgeous Clayton Gardens area as it would tear apart the fabric of the community. He referred to the staff report prepared for the May 2nd conceptual presentation of the 121 North Brentwood project and the lack of mention of text amendments at that time. Mr. Berger made reference to the use table which sets forth uses and that multi-family dwellings are allowed in the R-3 through R-7 districts with a conditional use permit. He stated that he does not believe this is in error; the City has the right to interpret as they choose; townhouse developments have already been built and the precedent set. He stated that the word “may” is permissible; not restrictive and believes that a townhouse requires a conditional use permit. He noted that the property (121 North Brentwood) was used as a doctor’s office for over 30 years with residential use on the second floor, but that’s gone now and not relevant now.

Chairman Lichtenfeld informed Mr. Berger that we are not discussing 121 North Brentwood at this time.

Mr. Berger stated that the point is, the Porta’s will suffer as will all of Clayton Gardens if that development is allowed. He stated that the residents are afraid and are looking for protection; protection that conditional use permits offer. He added that if this townhouse gets built, it will tower the Porta’s beautiful home.

Joanne Boulton reiterated that this discussion is about text amendments; not the proposed North Brentwood project.

Mr. Berger stated that a conditional use permit is critical. He said he is okay with changing the code to address townhomes, but he sees no reason not to require a conditional use permit to offer protection. He begged the Commission to give this careful consideration.

Chairman Lichtenfeld announced that many comments he is hearing apply to the second agenda item (North Brentwood proposal).

Joanne Boulton asked if the townhouses depicted in staff’s report required a conditional use permit.

Louis Clayton stated that the fee simple ones did.

Ron Reim asked if fee simple townhouses would still require a conditional use permit under the proposed text.

Louis Clayton replied “yes” ; if they are on multiple lots.

Joanne Boulton asked to clarify if a townhouse is a type of building or an ownership form.

Louis Clayton stated that a townhouse style building still could be under a condo association. He noted differences are that sometimes owners own their unit and the lot under, in front of and behind it and other times an owner only owns a unit.

Joe Leverich, 8160 Stratford, voiced his strong objection to both requests (text amendments and rezoning). He stated that spot zoning is an undesirable approach and the text modifications are not only inappropriate, they are unnecessary. He concurred that a conditional use permit is an important tool to ensure high quality developments.

Bill Snyder, 8133 Westmoreland, commented that these are excellent points.

Mark Stone, 8141 Westmoreland, stated that there is already a mechanism in place to permit townhouses in Clayton and as such, the changes don't seem necessary and are being presented to correct a perceived problem. He stated that the text creates ambiguity and suggested they not proceed with them.

Hearing no further questions or comments, Joanne Boulton made a motion to close the public hearing. The motion was seconded by Ron Reim and unanimously approved by the members.

Chairman Lichtenfeld asked if any of the members had any further comments or questions.

Hearing nothing further, Joanne Boulton made a motion to table consideration of these text amendments until the four issues outlined in staff's report can be specifically addressed. The motion was seconded by William Liebermann.

Chairman Lichtenfeld announced that he tends to agree; he wants to be sure everything fits together and he's not comfortable missing other changes. He stated he would like time to review everything as a whole. He added that the rezoning request for 121 North Brentwood Boulevard will still be considered this evening.

The motion was unanimously approved by the members.

Susan Istenes announced that given the recommendation, staff will withdraw its application for the text amendments.

PUBLIC HEARING - REZONING – 121 NORTH BRENTWOOD BOULEVARD

Mike Rechan, developer, and Paul Doerner, project architect, were in attendance at the meeting.

Susan Istenes explained that the 14,926-square-foot property is located at the southwest corner of North Brentwood Boulevard and Westmoreland Drive, has a zoning designation of R-2 Single-Family Dwelling District and is located in the Clayton Gardens Urban Design District. The subject property was originally developed and used as a single family

residential structure, however over 30 years ago, the ground floor use was converted into a medical office and the second floor was used for residential purposes. The most recent medical tenant vacated the premises in 2011 and the building has recently been demolished. Director Istenes referred to specific criteria to be contemplated when considering a rezoning. She noted an error in the staff report that indicated a minimum lot size for a single family residence in the R-2 zoning district as 5,000 square foot; the correct minimum lot size is 7,500 square feet. Director Istenes stated that the developer is requesting a rezoning to R-4, Low Density multiple-family dwelling, because he is proposing a new development project which consists of the construction of a four unit town house dwelling on a single lot with shared open space. Each unit will have access to two underground parking spaces. On May 2, 2016, the project was presented conceptually to the Plan Commission/Architectural Review Board. While multi-family is a permitted use in the R-4 Zoning District, the proposed use would be considered a townhouse which is defined in the zoning regulations but, due to what appears to be an error, is not expressly permitted in any zoning district. Therefore, the project will require approval of a text amendment to the Zoning Regulations in addition to the rezoning. The details of the design of the proposed project are not under consideration as part of the rezoning; however, if approved, will be examined through the subsequently required Site Plan Review and Architectural Review processes.

Joanne Boulton made a motion to open the public hearing. The motion was seconded by Ron Reim and unanimously approved by the members.

Chairman Lichtenfeld noted that while comments are appreciated, he asked that comments not be repeated.

John Porta, 8110 Westmoreland Avenue, voiced his opposition to the rezoning. He stated that he moved here from the City 2 years ago, when the subject property contained a first floor medical office and a residence on the 2nd floor. He stated that this is a neighborhood of single-family residences. He added that he knew 121 was for sale and was comforted by the fact that it is zoned single-family residential. He stated that the developer wants to turn the alley into a constant stream of vehicles. He noted that Brentwood Boulevard provides a buffer between them and Maryland Walk and that if this is approved, that barrier will jump to the west and will begin the push to turn single family lots into multi-family. He stated that the Master Plan recognizes the need to protect Clayton Gardens and that this building would tower over the houses; noting that there is no other similar density found in Clayton Gardens.

Chairman Lichtenfeld announced that there will be a break in public comment for now to give the applicant a chance to make their presentation.

Mike Rechan, developer, began a PowerPoint presentation.

Chairman Lichtenfeld advised Mr. Rechan that only the rezoning application is being considered; not architectural review.

Mr. Rechan noted that he lives in the neighborhood and held a community meeting where he heard a lot of input and a lot of opposition. He distributed letters in support of the rezoning. He stated that contrary to previous comments, he is not an out-of-town developer. He noted that he is asking for four units when, in fact, eight or nine could be built there; he developed three single-family residences on the former masonic lodge site where there could have been twelve. He stated that the previous landlord allowed the commercial use to lapse and that this property has never been used as single family. He noted that he could ask for a variance from the Board of Adjustment that would probably have been approved. He commented that this project will enhance property values and the lot is not a typical size; it is large and can accommodate four units. He added that the alley is already pretty active and that the Maryland Walk site used to be a car dealership.

Slides depicting various photos of the neighborhood/alley were presented, including parking meters along Brentwood Boulevard. He emphasized that his proposal includes below grade parking and that the building would be 23-feet off the Porta's property. He added that there is no extra lot coverage allowance for R-4; there is a height increase of an extra story.

A slide depicting a color rendering of the project was shown. Mr. Rechan commented that it would be tough to make the argument that this is out of place in the neighborhood, while showing views from Oceano Bistro with Maryland Walk nearby and slides of two story homes adjacent to one story homes.

Chairman Lichtenfeld asked Mr. Rechan to go back to the rezoning request.

Joanne Boulton told Mr. Rechan that he is making assumptions based on an R-4 zoning; she asked him to focus on the rezoning.

Mr. Rechan reiterated that he has letters of support and that not everyone opposes this request.

Joanne Boulton asked the applicant if he felt that there was a precedent due to the previous use of the property.

Mr. Rechan commented that the historical use of the property has been more than one unit and this panel needs to decide what the appropriate transition is. He stated that this development will not add a traffic burden.

Joanne Boulton asked Mr. Rechan if he believes the prior use of the property is pertinent here.

Mr. Rechan replied "yes".

Chairman Lichtenfeld reminded Mr. Rechan that the property is zoned R-2.

Mr. Rechan concurred and added that he proposes to change it to R-4.

Chairman Lichtenfeld announced that the Commission would now hear additional public comments. He reiterated that comments not be repeated.

Charles (last name unintelligible), 8137 University Drive, stated that he has lived in Clayton for 50 years and is a former President of the Clayton Gardens neighborhood Association and that he has nothing against the developer, as he has done a terrific job. He noted the Portas bought their property with the expectation that it will be a single-family use. He stated that Clayton needs to recognize its residents and that the residents should prevail; this is spot zoning and spot zoning is not legal. He asked the members how they would feel if this was their area. He concluded by saying that if this rezoning is approved, rezonings could extend further.

Mr. Leverich (8160 Stratford), encouraged the owner to propose a nice home. He stated that although the staff report indicates that design is not being considered, he believes that if the rezoning is approved, the lot could only support 8 units; not 9. He stated that there is no lack of housing diversity and that more units mean more traffic.

Chris Bauer, 8140 Kingsbury, stated that he left the City due to spot zoning and that the lapse in medical use does not constitute allowing a multi-family. He stated that this is the right project in the wrong place. He stated that half of condo units are rental and this project would create transient living. He asked if Clayton is providing a tax incentive for this project.

Chairman Lichtenfeld indicated that an answer to that would come at a later time.

Mr. Bauer asked if a study has been conducted to determine the results of quadrupling the sewer usage and/or the impact this will have on Clayton's streets.

Jean Beck, Kingsbury Boulevard resident, indicated that if this is approved, she knows of another property waiting to be sold and once the door is open, it would be difficult not to approve another.

Mr. Berger indicated that, with reference to the support letters, he had talked with some of the area business owners on Maryland Avenue and he was told they were approached by high-schoolers who spoke with Maître d's and the like, so he doubts the owners actually signed the petitions. He stated that this is about the future and that they have consulted with Richard Ward, a Land Use Planner who could not be here this evening, but believes this is an incompatible use.

Chairman Lichtenfeld reminded Mr. Berger that this is a rezoning issue.

Mr. Berger asked staff to amend their report to require a conditional use permit so as to have safeguards in place.

Steve Luebe, 8125 Westmoreland Avenue, stated that he's been in Clayton for 10 years and is trying to imagine a building towering over his property and the amount of traffic at least 8 more

cars will generate, resulting in an unsafe environment. He stated he opposes the rezoning and asked that a house be built there.

Mark Stone, 8141 Westmoreland Avenue, voiced his opposition to the rezoning, due to the potential increase in parking and traffic. He stated that a multi-family use seems conflicting with the single family homes. He asked that the members carefully consider the impacts this will have and that there should be a compelling reason to rezone one lot in an area containing only single-family homes. He reiterated that there will be significant impacts if this property is rezoned.

Ken Goldman, a 31 year Clayton resident, informed the members that he enjoys the quality of life Clayton offers and that multi-family has a different feel. He asked that the rezoning be denied; that the neighborhoods be protected.

Mark Redohl, 8104 Pershing Avenue, asked that the area remain single-family.

No further questions or comments were received.

Joanne Boulton made a motion to close the public hearing. The motion was seconded by Ron Reim and unanimously approved by the members.

Joanne Boulton thanked everyone for attending this evening. She stated that she has concerns about the potential for high-density development and does not support a rezoning.

Chairman Lichtenfeld stated that he respects staff's professional comments and that the developer and architect have done magnificent work in Clayton, although he tends to agree with Alderman Boulton. He stated that he's not ready to support a rezoning of the property; but possibly in the future. He noted that Clayton Gardens is a unique residential area abutting vibrant commercial areas and that he, too, believes that a natural boundary is there. He reiterated that he does not support the rezoning.

Hearing no further questions or comments, Joanne Boulton made a motion to recommend denial of the rezoning to the Board of Aldermen. The motion was seconded by Craig Owens and received unanimous approval by the members.

Chairman Lichtenfeld thanked everyone for their interest.

Being no further question or comments, this meeting adjourned at 7:35 p.m.

Recording Secretary